

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 are pending, in which claims 3, 5, 12, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no claims are withdrawn from consideration, currently amended, or newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Final Office Action mailed March 29, 2011 rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-18, and 20 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (US 2002/0105911) in view of *Bahadiroglu et al.* (US 2002/0186660), and *Bertram et al.* (US 6,144,379) and claims 19 and 21 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (US 2002/0105911) in view of *Bahadiroglu et al.* (US 2002/0186660), *Bertram et al.* (US 6,144,379), and *Hilliker* (US 2002/0100422).

Applicants respectfully maintain that the obviousness rejection over *Pruthi*, *Bahadiroglu*, and *Bertram* is in error, as none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “the sequence of messages read in by the selector is dependent upon a selection of a specific point of the course of the first characteristic feature that is selectable in the second region,” “the display device is configured to display a selectable marking produced automatically by the selector in the second region based on a predefined additional item of information stored during storage of messages in the storage device,” and “upon selection of the marking, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device,” as positively recited in the claims. The Final Office Action (page 2) states that *Bertram* teaches the above-noted limitations because:

Bertram teaches CPU provide obtains or fetches various parameters including memory I/O parameter in associated with % storage capacity, which is stored in database (Fig. 4, col 4 lines 12-32, col 5 lines 19-29, 41-49, col 6 lines 35-50). The first characteristic feature is the line graph indicating % storage capacity on pop up window 101. Furthermore, *Bertram* also teaches display screen displays, clickable icons produced automatically by system, e.g., CPU, on the line graph of

% storage capacity change over a 12 hour periods to show line graph of memory I/O parameter, which is store in memory and, by clicking the icon, memory I/O parameter in associated with % storage capacity at corresponding time , e.g., 3PM, which is stored in a database (Fig. 4, col 4 lines 12-32, col 5 lines 19-24, col 6 lines 16-50). Meaning, displaying clickable icon produced automatically by system in the popup display based on memory I/O parameter in associated with % storage capacity at 3PM, which is stored in a database is equivalent to displaying the marking produced automatically by the selector in the second region based on a predefined addition item of information stored during storage of messages in the storage device.

As best understood, the Office Action equates the distribution parameter shown in the first display with a sequence of messages, the line graph of % storage capacity for a single server with a course of a first characteristic feature, the markings at each hour with automatically produced markings based on an additional item of information stored during storage of messages in the storage device, and selection of the marking as displaying a sequence of messages read in from storage corresponding to the selected point. However, as explained in the previous response, the first display does not display a “sequence of messages;” it is a snapshot of averaged values of data. Claim 1, for example, recites “a sequence of temporally successive messages,” which is a succession of messages over time, not a snapshot at a given time. There is no sequence of messages being read in by the selector and displayed; the data from the database is averaged, and the averaged values are displayed. Further, the line graph is not a display of a course of a first characteristic feature; it is merely an expansion of a point from the first display. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the line graph is a display of a course of a first characteristic feature, the selectable markings on the line graph are not based on a second characteristic feature stored in the database. The markings are based on a clock; they are every hour. At best, a second characteristic feature (that which is displayed after selecting the marking) is based on the markings (the time), but the markings are not based on the second characteristic feature.

Selection of a particular time brings up other data that applies to that particular time, but not another sequence of messages. Clearly, if all of the data relates to a single time, it cannot be a sequence, or temporal succession, of messages.

The Final Office Action (pages 3-4) further disagrees that the motivation for combining *Bertram* with *Pruthi* and *Bahadiroglu* fails to result in the claimed limitations, and essentially repeats portions of the rejection. However, as explained in the prior response, *Bertram*'s goal of providing less cluttered graphical display access to communication networks (i.e., the motivation cited in the Office Action for combining *Bertram* with *Pruthi* and *Bahadiroglu*) is accomplished in a different way than that claimed. Specifically, the claimed method begins with a sequence of all messages, displays a portion of those messages (those corresponding to a first characteristic), and then a third display shows messages having a second characteristic and corresponding to a point in the second display. As discussed *supra*, *Bertram* does not begin with a sequence of messages, but rather begins with an average of stored data. Thus, the first display is already a reduced display, in contrast with the claimed first display. The second display is an expansion of one point from the first display, rather than a portion of the first display corresponding to a first characteristic or a reduction from the first display. Then, the third display is yet different data, rather than a sequence of messages that correspond to a second characteristic. Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Pruthi*, *Bahadiroglu*, and *Bertram* fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding the rejection of claims 19 and 21, Applicants argued in the previous response that *Hilliker* fails to disclose selectable markers based on a second characteristic and, therefore, fails to provide motivation for making the second characteristic a change in attenuation. The

Final Office Action (pages 4-5) responds by repeating that *Bertram* discloses selectable markers based on an additional item of information stored during storage of messages in the storage device. However, as explained *supra*, the proposed combination of *Pruthi*, *Bahadiroglu*, and *Bertram* does not teach or suggest selectable markings based upon a second characteristic, and *Hilliker* does not teach or suggest selectable markings based upon a second characteristic. Therefore, *Hilliker* cannot provide the motivation for making the second characteristic a change in attenuation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19 and 21.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

May 2, 2011
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Anita Pellman Gross
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 63325

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9951
Fax (703) 519-9958